UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/786,749	02/25/2004	Christopher E. Bales	BEAS-01372US0	2989

23910 7590 03/12/2008

FLIESLER MEYER LLP
650 CALIFORNIA STREET
14TH FLOOR
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94108

EXAMINER	
KEATON, SHERROD L	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2174	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
03/12/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/786,749	BALES ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Sherrod Keaton	2174	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *03 December 2007*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-22 and 24* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-22 and 24* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *2/08,12/07*.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

This action is in response to the RCE filing of 12-03-07. Claims 1-22 and 24 are pending and have been considered below:

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-22 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ng et al. ("Ng" US 6285366 B1) in view of Brassard et al. (" Brassard" US 6769095 B1) and Microsoft Windows ("Windows Explorer") copyright © 1981-2001.

Claims 1 and 17: Ng discloses a method, interactive tool (Column 4, Lines 49-56), machine readable medium and computer readable medium (Column 2, Lines 29-35) for interactively manipulating a graphical hierarchy including a plurality nodes comprising:

a.) Selecting a second node in the hierarchy, different from the first node, the first node being a root node of the hierarchy (Column 4, Lines 11-48; Column 10, Lines 56-67) the

first node is the root node and lower nodes can be selected which are subtrees in the hierarchy and not the root node;

b.) providing view of hierarchy where the second node is the root node of the viewer (Column 2, Lines 51-58); Ng allows multiple nodes to be displayed, and also allows for different selection of launch nodes which can further display more of a hierarchy tree, launch a website, or display further information about the node.

However Ng does not explicitly disclose:

c.) selection of one of the plurality of nodes can invoke a context sensitive editor for information associated with the node. But Brassard discloses a hierarchically structured control information editor and further discloses a context sensitive editor to create, modify and display hierarchically structured control information (Column 4, Lines 6-34). Therefore it would have obvious to one having ordinary skill at the time of the invention to add context sensitive editing with the hierarchy navigation system of Ng. One would have been motivated to allow the context sensitive editing to add to user-friendliness of the invention and would make the invention efficient allowing the user to have personalized text and visual indicators.

Neither Ng or Brassard disclose wherein the context sensitive editor is different for different selected nodes and wherein when a top portal node is selected, the context sensitive editor allows for the creation of a new portal, the new portal being associated with a new node in the hierarchy below the top portal node and wherein when a specific

portal node below the top portal node is selected, the context sensitive editor allows for inputting field data concerning the specific portal. However Windows explorer discloses different editing features pertaining to the node (Figures 2 and 3) and at the top portal (desktop) an additional node is created below (Figures 4 and 5; they show no node in hierarchy but once a new folder is created and added into the hierarchy as node (10786749). Last the context sensitive editor allows for node (10786749) to input information concerning the portal (Figure 6). Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include these features in the context sensitive editor of the modified Ng as taught by Windows explorer. One would have been motivated to provide the features because it improves functionality of the system.

Claim 2: Ng, Brassard and Windows Explorer disclose a method as in Claim 1 and further disclose restoring an original view of the hierarchy (Ng: Column 4, Lines 49-56).

Claim 3: Ng, Brassard and Windows Explorer disclose a method as in Claim 1 and further discloses:

a.) selecting a third node in the hierarchy where third node is different from first and second (Ng: Column 4, Lines 11-48; Column 10, Lines 56-67); and

b.) providing a view of the hierarchy where third node is root node (Ng: Column 2, Lines 51-58).

Claim 4: Ng, Brassard and Windows Explorer discloses a method as in Claim 3 and further disclose restoring a previous view of the hierarchy (Ng: Column 4, Lines 49-56).

Claim 5: Ng, Brassard and Windows Explorer disclose a method as in Claim 1 and further disclose the plurality of nodes representing information pertaining to portal resources (Ng: Column 7, Lines 29-46).

Claim 6: Ng, Brassard and Windows Explorer discloses a method as in Claim 1 and further discloses the view of the hierarchy being part of a portal administration tool (Ng: Column 6, Lines 45-54).

Claim 7: Ng discloses a method for interactively manipulating a graphical hierarchy including a plurality nodes comprising:

a.) Selecting a second node in the hierarchy, different from the first node the first node being a root node of the hierarchy (Column 4, Lines 11-48), (Column 10, Lines 56-67) the first node is the root node and lower nodes can be selected which are subtrees in the hierarchy and not the root node;

b.) providing view of hierarchy where second node is root node of the viewer. (Column 2, Lines 51-58); Ng allows multiple nodes to be displayed, and also allows for different selection of launch nodes which can further display more of a hierarchy tree, launch a website, or display further information about the node.

d.) the plurality of nodes representing information pertaining to portal resources (Column 7, Lines 29-46);

e.) the view of the hierarchy being part of a portal administration tool (Column 6, Lines 45-54).

However Ng does not explicitly disclose:

c.) selection of one of the plurality of nodes can invoke a context sensitive editor for information associated with the node view does not show the root node of the hierarchy. But Brassard discloses a hierarchically structured control information editor and further discloses a context sensitive editor to create, modify and display hierarchically structured control information (Column 4, Lines 6-34). Therefore it would have obvious to one having ordinary skill at the time of the invention to add context sensitive editing with the hierarchy navigation system of Ng. One would have been motivated to allow the context sensitive editing to add to user-friendliness of the invention and would make the invention efficient allowing the user to have personalized text and visual indicators.

Neither Ng or Brassard disclose wherein the context sensitive editor is different for different selected nodes and wherein when a top portal node is selected, the context sensitive editor allows for the creation of a new portal, the new portal being associated with a new node in the hierarchy below the top portal node and wherein when a specific portal node below the top portal node is selected, the context sensitive editor allows for inputting field data concerning the specific portal. However Windows explorer discloses

different editing features pertaining to the node (Figures 2 and 3) and at the top portal (desktop) an additional node is created below (Figures 4 and 5; they show no node in hierarchy but once a new folder is created and added into the hierarchy as node (10786749). Last the context sensitive editor allows for node (10786749) to input information concerning the portal (Figure 6). Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include these features in the context sensitive editor of the modified Ng as taught by Windows explorer. One would have been motivated to provide the features because it improves functionality of the system.

Claim 8: Ng, Brassard and Windows Explorer disclose a method as in Claim 7 and further disclose restoring an original view of the hierarchy (Ng: Column 4, Lines 49-56).

Claim 9: Ng, Brassard and Windows Explorer discloses a method as in Claim 7 and further discloses:

a.) selecting a third node in the hierarchy where third node is different from first and second (Ng: Column 4, Lines 11-48; Column 10, Lines 56-67); and

b.) providing a view of the hierarchy where third node is root node (Ng: Column 2, Lines 51-58).

Claim 10: Ng, Brassard and Windows Explorer disclose a method as in Claim 9 and further disclose restoring a previous view of the hierarchy (Ng: Column 4, Lines 49-56).

Claim 11: Ng discloses an interactive tool for interactively manipulating a graphical hierarchy including a plurality nodes comprising:

a.) ***means*** for selecting a first node in the hierarchy where the first node is different from a root node of the hierarchy (Column 4, Lines 11-48; Column 10, Lines 56-67) the first node is the root node and lower nodes can be selected which are subtrees in the hierarchy and not the root node;

b.) a (graphical user interface) GUI for providing a view of the hierarchy where first node is the root node of the viewer (Column 2, Lines 51-58); Ng allows multiple nodes to be displayed, and also allows for different selection of launch nodes which can further display more of a hierarchy tree, launch a website, or display further information about the node.

Ng does not explicitly disclose:

c.) selection of one of the plurality of nodes can invoke a context sensitive editor for information associated with the node. But Brassard discloses a hierarchically structured control information editor and further discloses a context sensitive editor to create, modify and display hierarchically structured control information (Column 4, Lines 6-34). Therefore it would have obvious to one having ordinary skill at the time of the invention

to add context sensitive editing with the hierarchy navigation system of Ng. One would have been motivated to allow the context sensitive editing to add to user-friendliness of the invention and would make the invention efficient allowing the user to have personalized text and visual indicators.

Neither Ng or Brassard disclose wherein the context sensitive editor is different for different selected nodes and wherein when a top portal node is selected, the context sensitive editor allows for the creation of a new portal, the new portal being associated with a new node in the hierarchy below the top portal node and wherein when a specific portal node below the top portal node is selected, the context sensitive editor allows for inputting field data concerning the specific portal. However Windows explorer discloses different editing features pertaining to the node (Figures 2 and 3) and at the top portal (desktop) an additional node is created below (Figures 4 and 5; they show no node in hierarchy but once a new folder is created and added into the hierarchy as node (10786749). Last the context sensitive editor allows for node (10786749) to input information concerning the portal (Figure 6). Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include these features in the context sensitive editor of the modified Ng as taught by Windows explorer. One would have been motivated to provide the features because it improves functionality of the system.

Claim 12: Ng, Brassard and Windows Explorer disclose a tool as in Claim 11 and further disclose the GUI restoring an original view of the hierarchy (Ng: Column 4, Lines 49-56).

Claim 13: Ng, Brassard and Windows Explorer disclose a tool as in Claim 11 and further discloses the

a.) if the second node in the hierarchy is selected, the GUI can provide a view of the hierarchy wherein the second node is the root node (Ng: Column 7, Lines 29-46);

b.) second node is a child of the first node (Ng: Column 7, Lines 29-46). The launch node can be a child node of any of the available nodes.

Claim 14: Ng, Brassard and Windows Explorer disclose a tool as in Claim 13 and further disclose a GUI restoring a previous view of the hierarchy (Ng: Column 4, Lines 49-56).

Claim 15: Ng, Brassard and Windows Explorer disclose a tool as in Claim 11 and further disclose the plurality of nodes representing information pertaining to portal resources (Ng: Column 7, Lines 29-46).

Claim 16: Ng, Brassard and Windows Explorer disclose a tool as in Claim 11 and further disclose the view of the hierarchy being part of a portal administration tool (Ng: Column 6, Lines 45-54).

Claim 18: Ng, Brassard and Windows Explorer disclose a method as in Claim 17 and further disclose instructions when executed will restore an original view of the hierarchy (Ng: Column 4, Lines 49-56).

Claim 19: Ng, Brassard and Windows Explorer disclose as method as in Claim 17 comprising instructions causing system to:

a.) select a second node in the hierarchy where second node is a child node of the first (Ng: Column 4, Lines 11-26);

b.) provide a view of the hierarchy where second node is the root node(Ng: Column 7, Lines 29-46). Once launch nodes are activated they become the root node in the additional window.

Claim 20: Ng, Brassard and Windows Explorer disclose a method as in Claim 19 and further disclose instructions when executed restoring a previous view of the hierarchy (Ng: Column 4, Lines 49-56).

Claim 21: Ng, Brassard and Windows Explorer disclose a method as in Claim 17 and further disclose the plurality of nodes representing information pertaining to portal resources (Ng: Column 7, Lines 29-46).

Claim 22: Ng, Brassard and Windows Explorer disclose a method as in Claim 17 and further disclose the view of the hierarchy being part of a portal administration tool (Ng: Column 6, Lines 45-54).

Claim 24: Claim 24 is similar in rationale to Claim 1 and is therefore rejected with same rationale.

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection as necessitated by the amendments.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sherrod Keaton whose telephone number is 571) 270-1697. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon. thru Fri. and alternating Fri. off (EST).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Dave Wiley can be reached on 571-272-3923. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-3800.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

SLK

3-1-08

/David A Wiley/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2174